AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 1 and 2. This sheet, which includes Figures 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including Figures 1 and 2, and is amended to increase the size of the text indicating the sheet number and the total number of sheets.

Also, in each of Figures 1 and 2, the legend indicating the Figure number is revised to have a larger print size, and the reference characters in Figure 1 are amended as to appear larger and also to appear without a rectangular border.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3 remain in this application.

Amendments to the Disclosure

The drawing figures are amended to increase the print size of the each of the legends and the reference characters. Figure 1 is further amended to remove the rectangular border around the reference characters. The amendments to the drawing figures are limited to formal revisions and do not introduce new matter.

The specification is amended to add section headings; no new matter is introduced by way of this amendment.

Claims 1-3 are amended to conform more closely to U.S. practice and preferences. In particular, claim 1 is amended to more clearly recite that the mono-block mobile equipment, the inlet deflector (1), and the outlet deflector (3) are exclusively formed of a same material. The amendments find support in the claims as originally filed, and also the specification and the drawing figures as originally filed, and do not introduce new matter.

New claims 4-7 ultimately depend from claim 1 and further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Claims 4-7

find support in the specification and the drawing figures as originally filed, and do not introduce new matter.

New claim 8 is independent and claims the invention in a form more consistent with U.S. practice. New claims 9-10 depend from claim 8. Claims 8-10 find support in the specification and the drawing figures as originally filed, and do not introduce new matter.

Formal Matters - Objections to the Drawings

The Official Action objected to the drawing figures, stating that Figure 1 uses brackets, circles, or the like in association with the reference numbers, and the height of ht reference and view numbers is less than 0.32 cm.

In reply, the drawing figures are amended as stated above in order to bring the drawing figures into compliance with PCT 11.13(h).

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing figures is respectfully solicited.

Substantive Issues - Section 102

The Official Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tacklind et al. (US Patent No. 5,732,709; hereinafter "TACKLIND").

The Official Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Peters (US Patent No. 4,733,570; hereinafter "PETERS").

The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons that follow.

The Anticipation Rejection over TACKLIND is Traversed

As to claim 1, the Official Action states that TACKLIND teaches a device comprising three components each made by a single molding step of plastic, making reference to column 10, lines 33-38 of TACKLIND.

TACKLIND teaches that "all parts can be manufactured of plastic utilizing low-cost processes," (column 10, lines 33-38).

TACKLIND is silent, however, of whether the parts are manufactured exclusively of plastic, and is further silent as to whether all the parts are manufactured of the same plastic.

Claim 1, as amended, requires that a mono-block mobile equipment, configured to rotate about a rotation axis, be formed exclusively of a plastic material, an inlet deflector be formed exclusively of the plastic material, and an outlet deflector formed exclusively of the plastic material.

TACKLIND does not teach this. The teaching that "all parts can be manufactured of plastic utilizing low-cost processes" (column 10, lines 33-38), for example, fails to exclude different kinds of plastic between the different parts

Further, TACKLIND fails to teach a mono-block mobile equipment, configured to rotate about a rotation axis, formed exclusively of a plastic material, as required by claim 1. On the contrary, TACKLIND teaches that the central post 82 of the

rotor 82 “includes at least one bar magnet 92,” column 9, lines 61-62; Figure 8). As a bar magnet fails to teach a plastic material, and in any case consists of a distinctive material from the surrounding material of the rotor 82, TACKLIND fails to teach the mono-block mobile equipment as recited by claim 1 formed exclusively of a plastic material.

According to a still further aspect of TACKLIND, the rotor has a central section oriented along the axis of rotation and the rotor blades extending from the central section to intercept tangential air flow at the circular boundary of cylindrical part (e.g., Figure 8). Thus, the spin axis is orthogonal to the direction of the expired air flow, and therefore is not provided any inlet deflector of the inlet air flow as it is clear that air flows directly on TACKLIND’s blades.

For at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that TACKLIND fails to teach or suggest the turbine device recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over TACKLIND.

It is further respectfully submitted that claims depending from claim 1 are patentable over TACKLIND at least for depending from a patentable parent claim.

For example, TACKLIND clearly fails to teach a mobile equipment consisting of one single piece of plastic material formed as a blade (2), a first extension, and a second extension, wherein the blade is planar, as required by dependent claim 4.

On the contrary, TACKLIND teaches a rotor comprising "a central post 84 with rotor blades 86 extending therefrom" (column 9, lines 55-57), the rotor being a "four-bladed rotor" (column 9, line 65) including "vertical vanes 88 disposed near the cylindrical side surface of the cylindrical section 72" (column 9, lines 57-59).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentable over TACKLIND in its own right in addition to depending from a patentable parent claim.

TACKLIND also fails to teach or suggest a rectangular blade, as required by claim 5.

Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over TACKLIND is respectfully requested.

It is further respectfully submitted that new claims 8-10 are patentable over TACKLIND at least for the reasons set forth above.

The Anticipation Rejection over PETERS is Traversed

As to claim 1, the Official Action states that PETERS teaches a device comprising three components each made by a single molding step of plastic, citing column 1, lines 55-56, column 2, lines 6-8, and column 2, lines 28-29 of PETERS.

PETERS teaches that a flowmeter comprises a housing 11 "made of a clear material, for instance glass-clear plastic," (column 2, lines 6-8). A distributor 16 is mounted in a cylindrical bore 15 of the flowmeter, the distributor being "made

integrally of plastic," (column 2, lines 12-15 and lines 28-29; column 1, lines 55-56). A plastic rotor 21 (column 1, lines 55-56), with plastic shaft tips 23,24 on either end, mates on one side with the distributor 16 and with the housing 11 on the opposite side (column 2, lines 38-45; Figure 1).

PETERS is silent, however, as to whether all of the housing 11, the distributor 16, the rotor 21 and the shaft tips 23,24 are formed of the same plastic material, as required by claim 1. On the contrary, PETERS teaches that the housing 11 is made of a clear material, but fails to teach that any of the other components should be clear. The Figures, by way of the pattern of the section lining of the housing 11, further suggest that the material of the housing 11 is different from that of the rotor 22 (Figures 1-3).

Claim 1, as amended, requires that a mono-block mobile equipment, configured to rotate about a rotation axis, be formed exclusively of a plastic material, an inlet deflector be formed exclusively of the plastic material, and an outlet deflector formed exclusively of the plastic material.

PETERS fails to teach this. At least for this reason, it is respectfully submitted that PETERS fails to anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over PETERS.

It is further respectfully submitted that claims depending from claim 1 are patentable over PETERS at least for depending from a patentable parent claim.

For example, PETERS fails to teach or suggest a planar blade as recited by claim 4.

On the contrary, PETERS teaches a rotor 21 having three curved blades 22 (column 2, lines 30-31; Figures 2-3). Clearly, no blade taught by PETERS is planar.

PETERS further fails to teach or suggest a rectangular blade, as required by claim 5.

Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over PETERS is respectfully requested.

It is further respectfully submitted that new claims 8-10 are patentable over PETERS at least for the reasons set forth above.

Substantive Issues - Section 103

The Official Action rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TACKLIND.

The Official Action further rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over PETERS.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2, as amended, is patentable at least for depending from a patentable parent claim based on the reasons set forth above.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claim 2 is earnestly solicited.

From the foregoing, it will be apparent that Applicant has fully responded to the September 19, 2008 Official Action and that the claims as presented are patentable. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims, as presented, and their early passage to issue.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the attorney for Applicant at the number set forth below if the Examiner is of the opinion that further discussion of this case would be helpful.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Jeremy G. Mereness/

Jeremy G. Mereness, Reg. No. 63,422
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JGM/fb

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

☐ – a terminal disclaimer

☐ – a 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration

☐ – a new or amended Abstract of the Disclosure

☒ – a Replacement Sheet for Figures 1-2 of the drawings

☐ – a Substitute Specification and a marked-up copy of the originally-filed specification

☐ – a verified English translation of foreign priority document